

Torrance Herald

Co-Publishers
KING WILLIAMS - GLENN W. PFEIL

REID L. BUNDY - Managing Editor

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1961

Success Foreseen

Success is not far away in the Harbor Area's 1961-62 Community Chest campaign, according to Fred Mill, chairman for the area.

Mill said there's a tremendous chance for area meeting its goal providing volunteer workers keep working until every kit has been completed.

"It just needs that extra push by all concerned . . . from the top leaders down to the individual workers . . . and we can reach our quota," Mill said.

To date Chest officials are reportedly optimistic about the progress of the over-all Los Angeles Chest drive which is made up from nine areas including the Harbor Area.

Quote

"No matter how grim the world looks, we find fresh encouragement each year — about the time the kids start writing confidential letters to Santa Claus." — Preston S. Foster, Elmer (N.J.) Times.

"Remember the old days—when they said legalizing and taxing liquor would provide enough revenues to run the government?" — Curtis Whaley, Powell (Wyo.) Tribune.

"Time was when the price of a Christmas tree was five cents a tree—and the buyer figured on paying for one out of six." — Leon W. Berry, Bingen (Wash.) Mt. Adams Sun.

"Winter must be close at hand. Last week we noted two hoboes riding a Santa Fe gondola." — Ward Lowe, Lometa (Tex.) Reporter.

"That south wind whipping across the playing field at Bethany Friday night was colder'n a Klondike well-digger's toes." — Hershel Smith, Lindsay (Okla.) News.

"One of the first things a child learns when he gets a drum is that he isn't ever gonna get another one." — Kenny Bennett, Greencastle (Ind.) Putnam County Graphic.

"If you're going to get even with someone, try those who have helped you." — Eryll Hoff, Wellington (Kans.) Monitor-Press.

"Freedom is a gift from the past, but it is not at all certain that it will be a legacy of the future." — E. L. Holmlund, Argyle (Minn.), Marshall County Banner.

"The UN might take a tip from the hockey games — come up with a penalty box for some of those countries to sit in for awhile." — Richard Mayer Jr., North Vernon (Ind.) Sun.

"The United States has a new therapy for world problems: Spending. As a neophilosopher recently said, the idea prevails in Washington, if you throw money at your problems, they disappear." — H. Sedloff, Portage (Pa.) Dispatch.

"About the only thing the matter with promoting old-fashioned Americanism is that it seems to offend those who don't want to offend old-fashioned Communists." — Robert E. Barnhart, Terra Bella (Calif.) News.

"A release from the Houston Social Security office reports that 'Anyone who reached age 65 or died before 1958 now needs only a year-and-a-half social security work to be fully insured.' Checks addressed care of St. Peter's?" — Elizabeth M. Douthit, Waller (Tex.) County Record.

"It'd take a king-sized cake of old-fashioned ash-hopper soap to clean up the latest joke Dick Maury told me this week." — Charlie Crawford, Lawrenceburg (Tenn.) Democrat-Union.

"At Sunday's dinner, 3-year-old Johnny recited his Bible verse memorized in the morning Sunday School class. Solemnly he intoned: 'We Can Sing, Though Full We May Be.' Translated: 'Weak and Sinful Though We Be.'" — Mrs. Martin Ford, Harmony (Minn.) News.

Morning Report:

Abe Mellinkoff

OUR DEFENSE DEPARTMENT has made great strides recently. In the same week, we sent Enos, a 37-pound chimp, two times around the world in a space ship and announced the end of the old chow-line eating trays.

The chimp did everything that was asked of him. And I assume this will make the astronauts, now in training to follow him, a little uneasy. They will look bad if they don't do as well.

But replacing trays with dishes will have more effect on the ordinary soldier. It's going to make KP duty more complicated. A really popular military break-through would be to train chimps to stack the new dishes.

THE THREAT OF WORLD COMMUNISM



But If Y'Send Me to Outer Mongolia



THIS WILD WEST by Lucius Beebe

Atomizers Okay Except Fastened to Gin Bottle

It is with mixed emotions, I think, that San Franciscans must have read an interview with the catering manager of the Fairmont Hotel in which, with remarkable candor for a man in a competitive business, he admitted it was possible to get a bad drink on his premises and that patrons of his, and other plush hotels and restaurants, were suckers pure and simple bent on showing off and neither knowing or caring what they got in return for being rooked.

In the matter of the bad drink, I confirm Mr. Henry Lewin's rather flippant fears. I personally got the worst drink in my recent experience in the Byzantine gin mill the Fairmont is pleased to call its Crown Room.

Encountering the magnificence of the legal profession, Jake Ehrlich, in the sidewalk outside the Fairmont on the way to dinner at Alexis, also a premises scarcely to be described as plain, we agreed to give the Fairmont our patronage and repaired to the widely touted Crown Room where I was the recipient, at Mr. Ehrlich's expense be it said, of the meanest, nastiest and most insolent Martini of a long career among the gin pots.

We are all familiar with the grisly gags about the dry Martini fanciers using atomizers for the vermouth and drying the ice on hand towels. Well, my Fairmont Crown Room Martini gave this legendary treatment not only to the vermouth, but also to the gin.

Now, Mr. Lewin frankly admits that the Fairmont drinks may be bad and their content illusory, and I confirm it, but when Mr. Lewin goes on to say that it doesn't matter "and is of no importance" he's in error. It is of a great deal of importance to me since I do admire waitresses in pseudo-colonial costumes serving pseudo-contemporary cocktails.

"People take off their hats in our hotel," deposes Mr. Lewin, as though this were a veritable Chesterfieldian ecstasy of refinement. "They want the hundred-dollar-a-day rooms and we can't get the customers into the cheap little old \$25- and \$35-a-day suites."

I'd like to suggest that this conversation might more appropriately have been recorded in Dallas than in San Francisco, and also that it sounds alarmingly like the sort of small talk that was going around the French court just before you-know-what happened to Louis XVI and the occupants of the hundred-dollar-a-day suites at Versailles and the Tuileries.

It seems eminently unlikely that the San Francisco populace is going to be roused by any latter-day Dennis Kearny in an attempt to put the Fairmont to the torch, and a large segment of San Francisco's downtrodden masses are lapping up Dom Perignon as the best customers of the Crown Room.

I don't want to carry a parallel too far, but there is an extraordinary similarity in Marie Antoinette's celebrated let-them-eat-cake attitude and that of the management of any public premise which says, in effect and with an arrogance that would be difficult to find precedent for, "of course our food stinks and our drinks are fraudulent, and the service is a corrupt and shiftless as union help can contrive, but you'll take it and like it and get your pockets picked because, you louts, it's elegant."

I think there is still an element in San Francisco that doesn't believe it's elegant or funny either to be insulted to its face by any maitre d'hotel who boasts that his customers are such vulgarities as not to know or care about the difference.

I think there is an element, declining perhaps, but still appreciable in the economic scheme of things, who aren't enchanted to be served drinks by waitresses at-

tired in preposterous period attire, or barkeeps gotten out in rigs that are a cross between a Bowery bouncer and a ballet dancer.

I am a member of this perhaps declining minority but I see others around me getting tolerably honest portions of food and whisky at several civilized San Francisco saloons. It is my sneaking and personal suspicion that gentlemen prefer to be served by bartenders in shirt sleeves and neat white aprons or black alpaca jackets and I also harbor the notion, obsolete among cost accountants, that the saloon that puts the bottle on the bar for the customer enjoys a better class of patronage than that which measures its drinks in nasty little jiggers.

One thing I am certain of: Herb Caen is outdated when he locates our own little outpost of Texas as the Jack Tar Hotel. It's a new stand. Right on top of Nob Hill.



"Kids expect more than when I was a boy."

ROYCE BRIER

Updating the Facts on America's Missile Gap

During the campaign last year, then-Senator Kennedy often charged a missile gap. It was not original with him, for the story was everywhere. President Eisenhower denied it, but the story stuck, derived apparently from Sputnik I.

About 1958 we were saying that by 1961 the Soviet Union would have 500-1,000 intercontinental missiles. So there was a missile gap, space gap, nuclear gap, even a bomber gap.

Most curiously, a year later we have another story, recently delivered by Roswell Gilpatric, deputy secretary of defense.

Despite Pacific firings and all, the estimate now is the Russians have 50-75 ICBMs. So, even if the estimate is low, where did the hundreds of hostile ICBMs go? No answer.

The bomber gap, going back to the mid-'50s, was a

fiction. There never was a nuclear gap, and 30 megatons doesn't change that. There was, and is, a space gap in one phase—Russian superiority in orbital satellites with big thrust and payload.

In a speech cleared by the President, Mr. Gilpatric produced a few figures: we have 43 ICBMs in place, will have 63 in a few months. We have 96 Polaris rockets and seven submarines. Including artillery, we have "tens of thousands" of nuclear delivery vehicles.

In the Strategic Air Command we have 855 B-47 medium bombers, 540 intercontinental B-52s, 40 supersonic B-58s. These planes carry up to 50 megatons each in nuclear warheads. At the present rate, we will have upward of 1,200 long-range missiles by 1965.

All this looks classified,

AFTER HOURS By John Morley

Case Against Federal Aid To Education Spelled Out

WASHINGTON, D. C. — Anyone who says that federal aid to education won't lead to federal controls is either not informed with the facts . . . or believes and wants controls for a variety of selfish or ideological reasons.

Federal aid invariably leads to controls. On our lecture tours across the country we run into what are called "impacted areas." These are fast-expanding communities (such as Torrance) where federal installations have brought thousands of families whose children have over-flowed the existing schools.

Such communities need, deserve and get federal aid. Where this has happened the federal bureaucrats do check the school curriculum and make "suggestions" . . . do "recommend" school programs . . . do inject their "ideas" on the type of teachers to be hired . . . do establish a "norm" for salaries . . . do have established "standards" to teaching as a whole.

When government hands out large sums of money, it should have the right to control how it will be spent. So when bureaucrats get to checking the spending, they also must have a standard for checking. This standard is control, no matter how you spell it. All prevailing public school systems now receiving federal funds are required to adhere to rules, or they will not qualify. It's that simple. This is control.

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act was set up to encourage study in mathematics and science as a part of the crash program following the Soviet Sputniks. The act specifically denies the right to control the curriculum to the recipient schools. But it does not work this way in real life when the bureaucrats move in. Here's an example:

The Davenport, Iowa, schools inquired about NDEA funds. They were asked to prepare voluminous forms, spelling out the school program, organization, salaries, methods of study, etc. The fact that the Davenport School system is university-accredited was not sufficient for qualification, according to the government bureaucrats. So the Davenport schools rejected federal aid.

Secretary of Education Abraham Ribicoff opened his nationwide campaign here in Washington to pressure the next Congress a federal aid-to-education bill. He stated . . . "The state and local governments cannot do the education job alone."

Why not? Why does Mr. Ribicoff think that federal dollars can buy a "higher quality of education" than state and local dollars? Why does he assume that Americans, who have built the richest country in the world, the finest system of educa-

tioning to do so? How come they don't realize what he realizes?

Further in his announcement, Secretary Ribicoff stated that the U.S. is falling behind Russia . . . "the Communists are giving systematic attention and major emphasis to training for goals consistent with their ideals." He quoted "spaceman" Ghermon Titov as saying "The Soviet Union doesn't kid around."

Then Mr. Ribicoff concluded . . . "We stick to the theory that the sum total of our diverse individual aims and aspirations will somehow add up to a solution of our national purpose to remain a free, strong, proud society."

Secretary Ribicoff at last has let the federal education cat out of the bag. His remarks clearly indicate that the aim of federal bureaucrats is to imitate the Soviet system and control the training of Americans toward whatever "ideals" they deem desirable.

In short, they aim to take complete control of future

generations through control of what is taught them.

If the Soviet system "does not kid around" . . . the New Frontiersman will see to it that the U.S. system does not kid around.

But rather should follow suit and constrict Americans' "diverse aims and aspirations" into a channel of conformity to the aims and aspirations of a powerful centralized state thousands of miles removed from the community of the school house.

Mr. Ribicoff did not spell out how such a federally directed educational system could maintain a "free, strong, proud society." Maybe he has found a way to eat the cake and have it, too.

We have gone much farther than developing the nuclear bomb. We are developing a socialist philosophy that says "the individual is not economically responsible for his own welfare — nor mentally responsible for his own conduct."

To this philosophy we will remain uncompromisingly opposed.

Hoppe in Wonderland

Changing Rules Seems in Order

ALMOST EVERYBODY in the UN is revising the Rules of War and making it illegal to blow anybody up with a nuclear bomb. I thought this was sort of a good idea. But then our side came out against it. So naturally I'm against it. After all, I'm sure our leaders in Washington know what's good for us.

Of course, the Rules of War are getting a little dated. As you know, it's legal to shoot, stab, fry or explode people. But you can't kill women and children. Except with bombs. Which, after all, is pretty humane.

NATURALLY, we keep a lot of germs and gas on hand in case those sneaky Russians use them first. If they used them first, we'd whack them back with same. It's simple common sense.

I guess that's where all these African and Asian nations got this idea to make using nuclear weapons illegal. Just like gas and germs. They said it was okay to whack someone with a hydrogen bomb if he whacked you with one first. But they wanted to make it against the rules for anybody to deliver the first whack.

As I say, this sounded like an idea. But then our side got up and said we couldn't go for a rule like that. On account of the UN Charter itself "recognizes the legitimate right of self defense." Like atomizing the other guy first. But the UN voted 60-16 in favor of the new rule. And Mr. Adlai Stevenson then said enough of this Communist trickery. Let's talk about something else.

MR. STEVENSON sure is right about the Communists being tricky. And we never could trust them to obey the rules. Either with gas, germs or H-bombs. But I thought it would be all right for us to agree to this new rule. Because we never, never, never will use nuclear weapons first. We've always said so. It's simple common sense.

Of course, I notice we haven't said so lately. In fact Mr. McNamara, our Defense Secretary, said the other day we'd use them whenever we thought we had to. So from all this, it's pretty clear we've now switched clean around to the new theory that we may have to use them first after all. In self defense, of course.

I know this new theory must be good for me. And I've been trying to think of some way to do my part. So I'm starting a petition to appeal the rule against us being the first to kill people with germs and gas. It's simple common sense.

LIFE'S LIKE THAT

By FRED NEHER



"Do you have a get well card for a father after he finds out he has to buy his daughter a new formal?"